

**OPINION 2254 (Case 3399)*****Dichochrysa* Yang, 1991 (Insecta, Neuroptera): generic name not conserved**

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that the application for the proposed conservation of the green lacewing generic name *Dichochrysa* Yang, 1991 (a replacement name for *Navasius* X.-k. Yang & C.-k. Yang, 1990) by making the name *Navasius eumorphus* Yang & Yang, 1990 available, is not approved. The priority of the generic name *Pseudomallada* Tsukaguchi, 1995 (type species: *Chrysopa cognatella* Okamoto, 1914, by original designation) is maintained.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Neuroptera; CHRYSOPIDAE; *Navasius*; *Dichochrysa*; *Pseudomallada*; green lacewings; antlions; Afrotropical; Nearctic; Oriental; Palearctic.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) It is hereby ruled that the application for the proposed conservation of the name *Dichochrysa* Yang, 1991 is not approved.
- (2) No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.

**History of Case 3399**

An application to conserve the name *Dichochrysa* Yang, 1991 for a widespread and speciose genus of Old and New World green lacewings, by ruling that the name *Navasius eumorphus* is available from its publication by Yang & Yang (1990) was received from J. Oswald (*Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, U.S.A*) on 1 November 2006. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 65: 178–182 (September 2008). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments were received on this case.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 September 2009 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 65: 181. The case received a majority of the votes cast but failed to reach the required two-thirds majority (14 votes FOR and 13 votes AGAINST). In accordance with Bylaw 35 the case was sent for a revote.

On 2 March 2010 the members of the Commission were invited to vote again on the proposals published in BZN 65: 181. At the close of the voting period on 2 June 2010 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 9: Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Krell, Pape, Papp, Patterson, Winston and Yanega.

Negative votes – 16: Alonso-Zarazaga, Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Kullander, Lamas, Lim, Minelli, Ng, Rosenberg, Štys and van Tol.

Zhou abstained. Pyle and Zhang were on leave of absence.



Five Commissioners all made similar comments in the first round of voting. Bouchet, voting AGAINST, said that since the names involved were established so recently (less than 20 years ago for *Navasius* Yang & Yang, 1990), he favoured a rigid application of the Code. Kojima, voting AGAINST, expanded on the same theme and said that even though *Dichochrysa* was widely used and the validation of *Pseudomallada* Tsukaguchi, 1995 resulted in the creation of new combinations for approximately 140 species, this would not result in serious problems for the neuropterid taxonomic community if this issue was handled properly. Yang & Yang (1990), Yang (1991), Yang (1997) and Yang et al. (1999) ignored or did not follow the provisions of the Code; if we tried to work within the Code, exceptional cases that request use of the plenary power of the Commission should be minimal. The species-group names were still available and valid based on Article 11.9.3.1 of the Code. The neuropterid taxonomic community needed to accept the creation of new combinations for approximately 140 species; unless there were many secondary homonyms, such a treatment would not be difficult to accept. Kottelat, voting AGAINST, also said that the case concerned only very recent names and the situation could have been avoided if authors had paid minimum attention to the requirements of the Code. He felt that approving this application would mean endorsing poor practices. Ng, voting AGAINST, expressed a similar perspective and said that as much as he respected the views of the several authorities and the specialist community involved, he did not see any immediate or long term negative consequences of merely using the name *Pseudomallada* Tsukaguchi, 1995. He felt that taxonomists could easily cope with any resulting short-term confusion. The fact that the species in question do not have a substantial broad-based impact for the rest of the biological community weighed heavily in his opinion. Yanega, voting AGAINST, said that *Pseudomallada* was validly published, available, and in use. As the oldest available replacement name, it should continue to be used, and *Dichochrysa* was better off not resurrected.

Similar perspectives were expressed again in the second round of voting. Voting AGAINST, Alonso-Zarazaga commented that since *Pseudomallada* had been in use since its description in 1995 and *Dichochrysa* was unavailable, the valid name was the former, no matter how 'deeply entrenched' the latter name had become in chrysopid literature in just a few years. He felt this only pointed to a lack of interest on nomenclatural aspects by its users. The creation of both names was too recent and made under a recent edition of the Code; a correction now was timely and feasible. He felt strongly that the Code was not to be used to perpetuate recent nomenclatural mistakes and irregular practices on the part of authors. These were not names used of old, and they were of interest for a minimal part of the zoological community.

No names are placed on the Official List and Indexes.